

Appl. No. 10/019,460
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 6 August 2003

Page 7 of 9

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application; claims 11-17 are newly added.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority. The applicants request the Examiner's assistance in resolving the lack of receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents EP00201507 and EP01200839. This application was filed under 35 U.S.C. 371 to enter the U.S. National Stage of a PCT application that identified the United States as a designated office. The priority documents should have been forwarded to the USPTO from the International Bureau.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to state whether the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action objects to the abstract for including the identification of "FIG. 5" after the body of the abstract. The abstract is amended herein to correct this error, and to also remove reference numerals.

The Office action provides guidelines for adding headings to the specification, but as headings are not required, the applicants respectfully decline.

Claims 1-10 are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label numbers, and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. These claims are not narrowed in scope and no new matter is added.

The Office action rejects:

claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Togane et al. (USP 5,138,290, hereinafter Togane);

claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Tokita et al. (USP 4,749,975, hereinafter Tokita); and

claims 1, 2, 3, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Luard et al. (USP 6,100,779, hereinafter Luard). The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Appl. No. 10/019,460
Amendment and/or Response
Reply to Office action of 6 August 2003

Page 8 of 9

Claim 1, upon which each of the other rejected claims depends, specifically claims a deflection unit for a cathode ray tube that includes *magnetic* material between the line deflection coils and the frame deflection coils.

The Office action notes that both Togane and Tokita teach a *ceramic* layer between the line deflection coils and the frame deflection coils, and that Luard teaches a synthetic *plastic* layer between the line deflection coils and the frame deflection coils. The applicants respectfully maintain that neither ceramic nor plastic can be considered a *magnetic* material, as the term magnetic is understood in the art, and as used in the applicants specification.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary defines a magnet as: "a body having the property of attracting iron and producing a magnetic field external to itself." As taught by the applicants, placing magnetic material between the line deflection coils and the frame deflection coils reflects the magnetic field generated by the line coils into the deflection volume. The applicants respectfully note that neither ceramics nor plastics will attract iron, produce a magnetic field, nor reflect a magnetic field, and thus cannot be said to correspond to the applicants' claimed magnetic material.

Because neither Togane, nor Tokita, nor Luard teaches a deflection unit with magnetic material between the line deflection coils and the frame deflection coils, as specifically claimed by the applicants, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) of claims 1, 2, 9, and 10 over Togane, claims 1, 2, 5, and 9 over Tokita, and claims 1, 2, 3, and 9 over Luard.

Claims 11-17 are newly added. In the interest of advancing prosecution in this case, the following comments are provided.

Claim 11, upon which claims 12-17 depend, claims a deflection unit for a cathode ray tube that includes a yoke ring that has at least two parts, wherein magnetic material is disposed in voids that are surrounded only by the part that is closest to the neck of the cathode ray tube.

The Office action notes, at page 7, that the prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a deflection unit having a yoke ring comprising at least two parts, wherein only the part of the yoke ring that is positioned closer to the neck portion of the CRT is filled with magnetic material.

Appl. No. 10/019,460
Amendment and/ r R sponse
Reply to Office action of 6 August 2003

Page 9 of 9

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert M. McDermott, Attorney
Registration Number 41,508
patents@lawyer.com

1824 Federal Farm Road
Montross, VA 22520
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525